

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-16, 18-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ogawa et al.* (US 5,608,874).

Claims 3 and 30 stand rejected under 103 as being unpatentable over *Ogawa et al.* in view of *Curtis et al.* (US 6,336,216).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1, 12, 21 and 30 are amended.

Claims 31-33 are added.

Accordingly, claims 1-31 remain pending for consideration.

**Interview Summary**

The undersigned wishes to extend his thanks to Examiner Brancolini and Supervisory Patent Examiner Burgess for their courtesies extended during the March 30, 2004 Examiner's Interview. The interview commenced with the undersigned explaining the features of invention. The invention was explained by reference to one of the disclosed embodiments of invention: a manufacturer / seller who wishes to receive bids for manufacture of a part by reference to a model of the part described in a Computer Aided Design (CAD) file. In this example, the seller has a list of intended recipients/suppliers from which a request for quote (RFQ) is desired. The list of suppliers and the CAD source file is provided to, e.g., a server over a network, along with specific instructions as to the nature of the RFQ. Because some, if not all of the suppliers may not have the ability to view the data contained in the CAD file, either because they do not have CAD software or they do not have software that is compatible with the CAD source file, a system for translating and communicating the source file in a format that is accessible to all suppliers is made available. The undersigned then explained how this aspect of invention was recited in proposed claim 31. New claim 31 is similar to proposed claim 31, and includes the following limitation:

(iv) providing means, provided with the first and second files, for generating screen images of physical data from the first and second files including software that allows the first and second recipient to define screen images using both a computer that has software that is capable of interrogating vector-based numerical data and a computer that is devoid of software that is capable of interrogating vector-based numerical data.

Thus, the "providing means" allows a recipient to view the "vector-based numerical data" even if the recipient's computer does not have software that is capable of viewing vector-based numerical data in a user-intelligible format. In the CAD file example, user-intelligible format would correspond to the data being presented as, e.g., 3-D images or mass properties of an article of manufacture defined in the CAD source file. A similar limitation to that quoted above is incorporated into the other independent claims 1, 12, 21 and 30.

The undersigned then discussed a second feature of proposed claim 31:

(ii) processing the source file for delivery to the recipients, including the steps of creating a first and second file from the data contained in the source file, wherein the first and second file type is defined by the solicitor;

(iii) providing access to the first and second files by only the first and second recipients, respectively;

In this aspect of invention, information originating from a single source file is communicated to a first and second recipient where the contents of the respective first and second files are specified by the provider of the source file. Returning again to the example of a seller who desires an RFQ from suppliers, some of the recipients on the seller's list may be trusted sources, and some may not, portions of the file may contain sensitive information, or the source file may contain information that is pertinent to a first recipients quote but not to another, etc. Whatever the reason, the provider of the source file will sometimes want to "customize" the content of the provided file depending on the recipient. Limitations (i) and (ii) are directed to this aspect of invention, although certainly not limited to the CAD file example.

The undersigned then turned to U.S. Pat. No. 5,608,874 (Ogawa), the reference used to reject pending claims 1-30. Ogawa is directed to a system for delivering data between two computers having incompatible software applications, e.g., MS Access and

Filemaker Pro database software. Ogawa's intent is to overcome the tedious process of requiring a user to manually input data into a software application because the original source file is incompatible or partially compatible with the user's preferred software application. Thus, Ogawa is concerned with providing a transparent transfer of data between two different software applications.

In contrast to Ogawa, the claimed invention provides a method, system and apparatus for accessing information in a source file that contains sophisticated information, such as vector-based numerical data, even if the user does not have software suited for interrogating a file that contains sophisticated information. Additionally, the invention provides a system and method for communicating data, based on information contained in a single source file that contains sophisticated information, in the form of file types that are customized as to the intended recipient. According to this aspect of invention, the delivered files are not simply translations of data from one file format to another.

Agreement was reached that either of the two limitations discussed above define over Ogawa, thereby removing it as an anticipating reference. The Examiner indicated, however, that he would need to review the art of record again to determine whether there is other art that needs to be considered before a notice of allowance can issue.

**The Rejection of the Claims in view of Ogawa**

Claims 1-30 stand rejected over Ogawa taken alone, or in combination with other art of record. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 1-30 be removed. Allowance of claims 1-30 is earnestly solicited.

New claim 31, and dependent claims 32-33, dependent therefrom, are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above. Allowance of claims 31-33 is earnestly solicited.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request consideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there remains any matters outstanding before a Notice of Allowance may issue, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at 202-739-5772.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Date: April 5, 2004

By:

  
James L. Reed  
Registration No. 43,877

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**

**Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel. (202) 739-3000  
Fax. (202) 739-3001